Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/538,239	TEBBUTT ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CLINTON OSTRUP	3771	
All Participants:	Status of Application:	<u> </u>	
(1) <u>CLINTON OSTRUP</u> .	(3) <u>LINDA PALOMAR</u> .		
(2) <u>RAIFORD BLACKSTONE</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 22 April 2009	Time: <u>4/16/09 at 12:45pm</u>		
Type of Interview:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed: 68, 70, 74, 85, 88, 89, and 90			
Prior art documents discussed: Robertson (EP 1075848 A2); Thornton (6,405,729); Barnett et al.	(2002/0043265)		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	B DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 			
/Clinton Ostrup/ Examiner, Art Unit 3771	applicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if a	appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. Blackstone 4/16/09 to inform him that after reviewing the amendment filed 10/16/08, and after conducting a search of the prior art, claim 74 was found to be allowable. The examiner suggested incorporating the limitations of claim 74, which depends from claim 70, into each of the independent claims to place the application in condition for allowance. Mr. Blackstone said he would pull the file and get back to the examiner. On 4/20/09 Ms. Palomar contacted the examiner and the examiner discussed the allowability of claim 74 with her and reiterated that if the limitations of claim 74 were incorporated into the independent claims, the application would be in condition for allowance. Ms. Palomar said she would contact her clients and let the examiner know their decision later in the week.

On 4/22/08 Ms. Palomar said her clients were not agreeable to the suggested changes and it was agreed that an Office Action would be mailed.